



28.

April 3rd 1915

Dear Mr. Burkill

Le Goc.

Mr. Goc. has referred to us your paper on Cross's

Hevea. We published last year a complete account of a
Hevea plantation about the introduction of Hevea into Ceylon &
the island of Peradeniya. If you did not receive a copy, will
you let us know.

the consequences of Hevea plants sown in Ceylon when
the rubber was almost past work. Consequently, we have very
few records relating to them. It may be said that the localities
at Peradeniya were in great measure the Hevea growing
in the island.

But there is no doubt that Ceylon received two consignments
of plants, one in 1876 and the other in 1877. It is also certain
that no one knows whether these were both planted at Peradeniya,
where they were planted in separate blocks there, or whether the second
consignment was retained at Peradeniya. We suppose that the
trees at Peradeniya are the survivors of both consignments and
therefore any seed sent from Peradeniya is ^{almost} ~~entirely~~ ^{as} ~~likely~~ ^{likely}
to be derived from Cross's trees as from Weyburn's.

We sent 400 seeds to Singapore in a wooden case in 1885,
and 115 seeds in bags in 1888. The latter date is given by

But is not all this somewhat superfluous as far as the Singapore trees are concerned. Singapore received plants direct from Kew in 1876. Ridley says these all died but Hurler said they did not. Another consignment was sent direct to Singapore in 1877. So Singapore, like Ceylon, received plants of both consignments.

We have always regarded the second consignment to Ceylon and Singapore as Cross's trees. But quite recently Kew has stated that it has no record that Cross's plants ever became fit to send out.

Trimen's statement ~~to~~ which you quote was based on data supplied by Dyce in 1880 or 1881. It is true that Dyce did not inform Trimén that the second lot were Cross's trees, but on the other hand he stated "at the time Cross arrived we had done with Hevea"; "we saved I think a warden careful to do justice to Cross". As they gave half the plants to Bull of Chelsea ~~now~~, it is difficult to see where the justice comes in, especially if they never distributed his plants.

The extraordinary thing about this introduction of Hevea is that Kew never wrote any account of it. Dyce furnished data to Trimén who wrote his account of 1881, & when in 1896 (?) Kew put out history of rubber cultivation, they simply adopted Trimén's version.

Hence our difficulties. And they are not lessened by the fact that Dyce, who claims to have been in charge of the whole operations, never tells the same tale twice. Both he & Ridley show an amazing disregard of dates, numbers, & facts. Trimén stated that the second consignment were Cross's trees; Kew raised no objection, but actually adopted the statement; now the new generation at Kew claims that Cross's trees were never sent to the East.

Of course, there is, as usual, a "backstairs" history of this. The India Office began the introduction of Hevea, and subsequently sought the assistance of Kew. They appear to have worked together amicably at first but to have differed about 1875. Wickham was Kew's man. Cross was the India Office man. And it is interesting to note that Cross was despatched for Hevea after Wickham's arrival.

The Kew reports do not deny Cross's assistance, but they minimise it as far as possible. Dyce, in 1878, wrote that Cross's plants "contributed but little to our resources for distribution". I find it difficult to suppose that Dyce would have given Cross any credit if he could have avoided it, for I may tell you, in confidence, that Dyce's letter to ^{Trimén} Cross exhibits a most virulent animosity towards Cross. It is ludicrous, ~~the~~ considering the difference in position of the two men.

But any definite evidence that the second circumstances
were Cross's could only have been furnished by him.
We have no covering letter so far as I have been able to
ascertain. The fact that they were sent with the
Cora files, which of course were Cross's, is a piece
of circumstantial evidence.

yours sincerely

— T. Gatch

13th April, 1915.

Dear Mr. Burkill,

Mr. LeGoc. has referred to me your query re Cross's Hevea. We published last year a complete account of all we know about the introduction of Hevea into Ceylon in the Annals of Peradeniya. If you did not receive a copy, will you let me know.

Both consignments of Hevea plants arrived in Ceylon when Thwaites was almost past work. Consequently we have very few records relating to them. It may be said that their location at Henaratgoda was due in great measure to Thwaites increasing infirmities.

But there is no doubt that Ceylon received two consignments of plants, one in 1876 and the other in 1877. It is also certain that no one knows whether these were both planted at Henaratgoda, whether they were planted in separate blocks there, or whether the second consignment was retained at Peradeniya. We suppose that the trees at Henaratgoda are the survivors of both consignments and therefore any seed sent from Henaratgoda is almost as likely to be descended from Cross's trees as from Wickham's.

We sent 400 seeds to Singapore in a Wardian case in 1885, and 11500 seeds in bags in 1888. The latter date is fixed by the Ceylon Botanic Gardens Reports for 1887 & 1888, and Trimen's diaries. But is not all this somewhat superfluous as far as the Singapore trees are concerned. Singapore received plants direct from Kew in 1876. Ridley says these all died but Murton said they did not. Another consignment was sent direct to Singapore in 1877. So Singapore, like Ceylon, received plants of both consignments.

We have always regarded the second consignments to Ceylon and Singapore as Cross's trees. But quite recently Kew has stated that it has no record that Cross's plants ever became fit to send out.

Trimen's statement which you quote was based on data supplied by Dyer in 1880 or 1881. It is true that Dyer did not inform Trimen that the second lot were Cross's trees, but on the other hand he stated "By the time Cross arrived we had done with Hevea"; "we saved I think a Wardian caseful to do justice to Cross". As they gave half the plants to Bull of Chelsea, it is difficult to see where the justice comes in, especially if they never distributed his plants.

The extraordinary thing about this introduction of Hevea is that Kew never wrote any account of it. Dyer furnished data to Trimen who wrote his account of 1881, and when in 1896(?) Kew put out a history of rubber cultivation, they simply adopted Trimen's version. Hence our difficulties. And they are not lessened by the fact that Dyer, who claims to have been in charge of the whole operations, never tells the same tale twice. Both he and Ridley show an amazing disregard of dates, numbers, and facts. Trimen stated that the second consignments were Cross's trees; Kew raised no objection, but actually adopted the statement; now the new generation at Kew claims that Cross's trees were never sent to the East.

Of course, there is, as usual, a "backstair" history of this. The India office began the introduction of Hevea, and subsequently sought the assistance of Kew. They appear to have worked together amicably at first but to have differed about 1875. Wickham was Kew's man: Cross was the India office man. And it is interesting to note that Cross was despatched for Hevea after Wickham's arrival.

The Kew Reports do not deny Cross's assistance, but they minimise it as far as possible. Dyer, in 1878, wrote that Cross's plants "contributed but little to ~~our~~ resources for distribution". I find it difficult to suppose that Dyer would have given Cross any credit if he could have avoided it, for I may tell you, in confidence, that Dyer's letters to Trimen exhibit a most virulent animosity towards Cross. It is ludicrous, considering the difference in position of the two men. But any definite evidence that the second consignments were Cross's could only have been furnished by Kew. We have no covering letter so far as I have been able to ascertain. The fact that they were sent with the Ceara trees, which of course were Cross's, is a piece of circumstantial evidence.

Yours sincerely,

(sl) T. PETCH.